

WARREN G. JEFFERSON, WASH.  
JOHN W. LITTLE, ILL.  
JOHN G. FORTY, N.J.  
ALAN HALL, NEV.  
ROBERT C. HYMAN, W. VA.  
DALE W. MCCLURE, WYO.  
BENJ. MAYERFELD, MONT.  
WILLIAM PUGHMAN, WIS.  
JOSEPH E. MONTOYA, N. MEX.  
EUGENE M. COOPER, MINN.  
FRANK ST. F. HOLLINGS, S.C.  
RICHARD DAY, IND.  
THOMAS F. CAGLETON, MO.  
LAWTON CHILES, FLA.

MILTON W. YOUNG, N. DAK.  
NORMAN L. HIGURA, N. DAK.  
RONNIE COTTON, N.H.  
CLIFFORD P. CASE, N.J.  
HUPA L. FONG, HAWAII  
EDWARD W. BIRCHOFF, MASS.  
MARK G. MATFIELD, OHIO  
TOD STEVENS, ALASKA  
CHARLES MC G. MATTHEWS, JR., MD.  
RICHARD S. SCHNEIDER, PA.  
HENRY BELLAND, OKLA.

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

September 10, 1973

THOMAS J. SCOTT, CHIEF CLERK  
JAMES H. CALLOWAY, COUNSEL

Secret

The Honorable Henry Kissinger  
Secretary of State Designate  
The White House  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Dr. Kissinger:

In the course of my review of the 1974 Defense Authorization Bill, I have paid particular attention to the Army's request for continued funding for the SAM-D missile. During this review, it came to my attention that there might be some question as to whether its phased-array radar could be in violation of Paragraph D of the initialed "Agreed Interpretations" of the AEM Treaty with the Soviets. In that connection, I initiated correspondence with Secretary Schlesinger, copies of which are enclosed for your information.

Aside from this technical question of whether the power of the phased-array radar used in SAM-D violates this specific provision of the treaty, the more I have examined the SAM-D, the more convinced I have become that this weapon system is justifiable only if its primary mission is its potential for use against tactical and intermediate range ballistic missiles. All of its operational characteristics make sense only if viewed in this light. If one accepts the Army's justification that its sole use is to be against tactical aircraft, then I am convinced that many of its capabilities are not only unnecessary, but are actually disadvantageous when compared with the alternative, an Improved HAWK system.

This raises a disturbing possibility in my mind. If I were a Soviet negotiator watching new U.S. weapon systems carefully, it would be clear to me that SAM-D was simply not justifiable as a conventional air defense weapon. This would suggest that what the U.S. was really doing was violating, to use your phrase of last Friday, the "spirit if not the letter" of SALT. The fact that this year's budget request specifically includes some \$5 million to "preserve the option" of equipping SAM-D with a nuclear warhead would further confirm this view.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE A/CDO/PMR  
Bureau of Consular Affairs  
REVIEWED BY Sanctor DATE 7/15/88  
RDS ☐ or XDS ☐ EXT. DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
TS AUTH. \_\_\_\_\_ REASON(S) \_\_\_\_\_  
ENDORSE EXISTING MARKINGS ☒  
DECLASSIFIED ☒ RELEASABLE ☒  
RELEASE DENIED ☐  
PA or FOI EXEMPTIONS \_\_\_\_\_

R

228

20/12

[illegible]

September 10, 1973

by Kissinger  
DECLASSIFIED

I appreciate your attention in this matter.

Birch Bayh

0345507020